

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 17, 2007. Claims 23 to 33 and 36 to 43 are in the application. Claims 23, 24, 27, 36 and 41 to 43 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 23 to 28, 30 to 33, 36, 37 and 41 to 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0034978 (Legge). Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Legge in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,496,703 (da Silva). Claim 38 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Legge in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,343,212 (Weber). Claim 40 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Legge in view of Weber and further in view of da Silva. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The present invention allows for transmission and/or reception of a communication function restriction request directed to a wireless communication terminal, for example, a request for a cellular phone to restrict its communication function to only non-real time communications, such as email, or restrict all incoming and outgoing calls, or some other communication restriction. In this way, for example, it can be easier and simpler to manage the communication functions of various wireless communication terminals.

Some embodiments of the invention can also include other features, such as permitting entrance/exit of a person when transmitting of the communication function restriction request and receiving of a response is complete (Claims 41 to 43), which can further include a gate device (Claims 23, 24 and 27), a restricting device adapted to restrict

communication in accordance with the communication function restriction request (Claim 36), and other features. These other features can provide additional advantages such as, for example, preventing a person from entering a library unless the person's cellular phone is set to manner mode.

Referring specifically to the language of the claims, independent Claim 41 defines a control method for a system having an entrance/exit management apparatus for regulating an entrance/exit of a person and a wireless communication terminal for communicating with the entrance/exit management apparatus. The entrance/exit management apparatus executes a transceiving step of transmitting, by a first wireless communication method, a communication function restriction request to the wireless communication terminal and of receiving a response to the communication function restriction request, and a permitting step of permitting an entrance/exit of a person when the transmitting of the communication function restriction request and the receiving of the response in the transceiving step is completed. The wireless communication terminal has a second communication device adapted to communicate by a second wireless communication method, and the wireless communication terminal executes a communication step of communicating, via a first communication device, with the entrance/exit management apparatus by the first wireless communication method, and a restricting step of restricting communication of the second communication device in accordance with the communication function restriction request received in the transceiving step by the first wireless communication method.

Independent Claim 23 is a system generally corresponding to the method of Claim 41, but is more specifically directed to a gate device adapted to permit the

entrance/exit. Independent Claims 27 and 43 are more specifically directed to an entrance/exit management apparatus as in Claims 23 and 41, respectively. Independent Claim 36 is more specifically directed to a wireless communication terminal generally corresponding to the wireless communication terminal of Claim 23.

The applied references are not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 23, 27, 36, 41 and 43, and in particular, are not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of transmitting, by a first wireless communication method, a communication function restriction request to a wireless communication terminal and of receiving a response to the communication function restriction request (Claims 23, 27, 41 and 43), and restricting communication of a second communication device in accordance with a communication function restriction request received by a first wireless communication method (Claims 23, 36 and 41).

In entering the rejections of 23, 27, 36, 41 and 43, the Office Action asserts that Legge's management station 30 transmits a communication function restriction request to an activity station 40, citing paragraphs [0039] and [0058] of Legge. (Office Action, page 3). However, paragraph [0039] of Legge are seen to disclose merely that a monitoring station 60 "monitors each of the activity stations 40 for, inter alia, security and maintenance purposes." (paragraph [0039] of Legge). Without more, this disclosure of Legge is not seen to disclose or to suggest transmitting a communication function restriction request.

Paragraph [0058] of Legge is not seen to cure the deficiencies of paragraph [0039]. In particular, paragraph [0058] of Legge deals in part with the management station 30 issuing client transponders 20, which can store "debit and credit data and time stamps . .

. [and] an individual marker for each customer”, and the activity stations 40 restricting access “based on the variety of event criteria” (paragraph [0058]), which Legge describes as including “a debit/credit indicator, a content rating, a time stamp, and/or an age and/or height restriction”. (paragraph [0026]). Legge’s issuing of client transponders 20 and event criteria such as a debit/credit indicator, a content rating, a time stamp, and/or an age and/or height restriction are not seen to disclose or to suggest transmitting a communication function restriction request.

The Office Action also corresponds Legge’s client transponder 20 to a ““second communication device,” adapted to communicate by the second wireless communication method”, and that Legge “teaches that the said transponder (20) is programmed with and [sic, an] event criteria (restriction information) to restrict the using client from certain information. See paragraph [0041].” (Office Action, page 4)(emphasis added). However, even if Legge could be viewed as disclosing restricting a using client from certain information¹, without more this is not seen to disclose or suggest restricting communication of a second communication device in accordance with a communication function restriction request received by a first wireless communication method. In particular, while Legge may be seen to disclose restricting access based on event criteria programmed into a transponder 20, such as a debit/credit indicator, a content rating, a time stamp, and/or an age and/or height restriction, without more, Legge is not seen to disclose or to suggest restricting communication of a second communication device in accordance

¹/Applicant does not concede the correctness of this characterization of Legge.

with a communication function restriction request received by a first wireless communication method.

The remaining applied references, namely da Silva and Weber, are not seen to cure the deficiencies of Legge, either alone or in any permissible combination. Accordingly, Claims 23, 27, 36, 41 and 43 are believed to be allowable.

Independent Claim 42 defines a control method for a system having an entrance/exit management apparatus for regulating an entrance/exit of a person and having a server apparatus for managing an entrance/exit of a person. Among other features, the system includes a feature of transmitting, by a first wireless communication method, a communication function restriction request to a wireless communication terminal and of receiving a response to the communication function restriction request.

Independent Claim 24 is a system generally corresponding to the method of Claim 42, but is more specifically directed to a gate device adapted to permit the entrance/exit.

As discussed above, the applied references are not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of transmitting, by a first wireless communication method, a communication function restriction request to a wireless communication terminal and of receiving a response to the communication function restriction request. Accordingly, independent Claims 24 and 42 are believed to be allowable.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the

invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.